



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,696	02/15/2002	Olivier Brique	16673-6	4633

7590 07/25/2008
Clifford W Browning
Woodard Emhardt Naughton Moriarty & McNett
Bank One Center Tower
111 Monument Circle Suite 3700
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

EXAMINER

ALAM, SHAHID AL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/049,696

Applicant(s)

BRIQUE ET AL.

Examiner

Shahid Al Alam

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 27 – 31 are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on April 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons.

In response to Applicant's argument, Applicants' agrees that Pirovano teaches database addressing and in Pirovano, each database comprises a unique identifier used for addressing.

Applicant teaches in the claim language that providing identical message without **any** database addressing, but Pirovano teaches databases addressing which can include general, random and various other form of database addressing.

The conditional updating of Yamagishi reference (Figure 11, column 15, line 19 – column 18, line 26) clearly teaches applicants' claimed limitation the conditional updating of the databases.

In response to argument, Applicants' argue that to minimize the data stream by sending an identical message to each receiver in an unidirectional way, but Yamagishi teaches a bi-directional communication and one of ordinary skill in the art should know that **unidirectional is a subset of bi-directional**. Therefore, Yamagishi clearly teaches applicants' claimed limitation.

With respect to Applicant's argument, Pirovano and Yamagishi teach the "useful data" substantially as claimed, however, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was to modifying data to be useful data since differences in type of data do not distinguish the invention in term of patentability.

See *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability).

For that reason, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action and believes that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 27 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0491069 A1 issued to Tullio Pirovano et al. ("Pirovano") and in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,370,143 issued to Yasuaki Yamagishi ("Yamagishi").

With respect to claim 27, Pirovano teaches a method for transmitting messages over a communication network (Figure 1, page 3, lines 7 – 8) to update a large quantity of network user terminal databases, the messages being transmitted from a managing center to a plurality of distributed user databases, each distributed user databases being stored in a user terminal (see Figure 1; page 3, lines 39 – 42), said method comprising the step of:

providing identical messages without any database addressing to be transmitted from the managing center, wherein each identical message includes controls that include queries for searching the useful data present in distributed user database (page 9, lines 30 – 35); and updating database criteria that determines whether said predetermined data is either present or not present in the content of the distributed user terminal database (see abstract and page 2, lines 47 – 54). Pirovano teaches Broadcaster (2) and Broadcast Transmission unit (3) which represents managing center where updating of database take place (see Figure 1).

Pirovano does not explicitly teach conditional updating of the distributed user database as claimed.

Yamagishi teaches a server structures at least update report data and transmits the update report data over a unidirectional broadcasting network enabling broadcast and contents of the database are updated with the distributed data (see abstract, column 1, lines 52 – 62 and column 6, lines 59 – 67) and conditional updating of the database (see Figure 11, column 15, lines 19 – 45).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Yamagishi with Pirovano to enable quick and efficient distribution of data (column 1, lines 49 – 50; Yamagishi).

As to claim 28, the connection between the managing centre and the databases is mainly unidirectional (page 2, lines 1 – 2).

As to claim 29, distributed user databases are integrated in Pay-TV reception subscriber's units and wherein the predetermined data comprise the reception rights of a subscriber (page 2, lines 29 – 39; Pirovano and column 7, lines 1 – 11; Yamagishi).

As to claim 30, the updating messages comprise a set of control-blocks comprising data and controls, and wherein said updating messages consist of carrying out comparison operations between the data and the contents of the distributed user database (Pirovano: page 6, line 34 – 39) and determining an action depending on the comparisons results, either to update the database, carry out the subsequent control block, to jump to another control block, or to terminate the message handling (Pirovano: page 5, lines 4 – 9).

As to claim 31, the database is divided or is of the relational type RDB (Yamagishi teaches database and distribution of data (column 1, lines 52 – 62 and column 6, lines 59 – 67)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Al Alam whose telephone number is (571) 272-4030. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00 A.M.- 4:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shahid Al Alam/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

July 18, 2008